DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 752 EC 123 907

AUTHOR Algozzine, Bob
TITLE The Disturbing Child: A Validation Report.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Inst. for Research on Learning Disabilities.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO IRLD-RR-8
PUB DATE Jun 79
CONTRACT 300-77-0491
NOTE 28p.: See also EC 123 901-925.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Behavior Problems; *Check Lists; Ecology; *Emotional Disturbances; *Learning Disabilities; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Two versions of the Disturbing Behavior Checklist (DBC), an indicator of the relative disturbingness of behaviors characteristic of mildly handicapped (emotionally disturbed and learning disabled) students were field tested with 250 and 150 university students, teachers, supervisors, and school psychologists. Both checklists were relatively reliable. In light of ecological theory which suggests that disturbance may result from an interaction between a child's behavior and reactions to that behavior within an ecosystem, use of the checklist to match teachers and children may be helpful. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185752

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

University of Minnesota

Research Report No. 8

THE DISTURBING CHILD: A VALIDATION REPORT

Bob Algozzine

IRLD

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

EC123907

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James Ysseldyke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IRLD

Director: James E. Ysseldyke

Associate Director: Phyllis K. Mirkin

The Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities is supported by a contract (300-77-0491) with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, through Title VI-G of Public Law 91-230. Institute investigators are conducting research on the assessment/decision-making/intervention process as it relates to learning disabled children. Research activities are organized into eight major areas:

I. Adequacy of Norm-Referenced Data for Prediction of Success

II. Computer Simulation Research on the Assessment/Decision-making/Intervention Process

III. Comparative Research on Children Labeled LD and Children Failing Academically but not Labeled LD

IV. Surveys on In-the-Field Assessment, Decision Making, and Intervention

V. Ethological Research on Placement Team Decision Making

VI. Bias Following Assessment

VII. Reliability and Validity of Formative Evaluation Procedures

VIII. Data-Utilization Systems in Instructional Programming

Additional information on these research areas may be obtained by writing to the Editor at the Institute.

The materials presented herein were prepared under government sponsorship. Contractors are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official position of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Research Report No. 8

THE DISTURBING CHILD: A VALIDATION REPORT

Bob Algozzine

University of Florida

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

University of Minnesota

June 1979

The Disturbing Child: A Validation Report

Traditional assessment practices for mildly handicapped youngsters rely heavily on checklists and rating scales of abnormal behavioral characteristics. The mildly handicapped youngster is often referred or identified as a result of a trained professional completing such an instrument; it is reasoned that too much or too little of certain characteristics is suggestive of one or another handicapping condition.

Evidence exists to suggest that teachers are differentially reactive to stimulus qualities (i.e., characteristics) of youngsters. In fact, such factors as appearance (Algozzine, 1976b; Berscheid & Walster, 1974; Ross & Salvia, 1975; Salvia, Algozzine, & Sheare, 1977; Salvia, Sheare, & Algozzine, 1975) race (Coates, 1972; Datta, Schaefer, & Davis, 1968; Rubovitz & Maehr, 1973), child's sex (Carter, 1952; Jackson & Lahaderne, 1967; Lippett & Gold, 1959; Meyer & Thompson, 1956; Palardy, 1969), and achievement level of older siblings (Seaver, 1973) have been shown to differentially effect the attitudes and interactions of teachers and their students.

Within this context, it has been suggested that a contributing factor to "emotional disturbance" may be the reactions of others to the behavior exhibited by the child. Rhodes (1967, 1970), in his presentation of ecological theory, indicated that behaviors exhibited by children may be differentially bothersome to individuals working with those children. The theory suggests that "disturbance" may be "in the eye of the beholder" and may be generated within an ecosystem when an individual's behavior is viewed as <u>disturbing</u> or bothersome by others in the system. Deviance, then, may be as much a function of <u>reactions</u>

FEB 13 1980

to behavior as it is the behavior in and of itself.

To begin to ascertain the extent to which there is construct validity within the ecological perspective of deviance, it is necessary to have an indicator of the relative "disturbingness" of behaviors characteristic of mildly handicapped youngsters. If predictable differential reactions to those behaviors can be demonstrated, then some support for the ecological theory will have been evidenced. The intent of this research report is to present the results of several studies relevant to this line of investigation.

The Disturbing Behavior Checklist

To facilitate the process of determining the relative "disturbingness" of behaviors characteristic of mildly handicapped youngsters, it seemed appropriate to develop more than one scale. Such a procedure would enable both between and within group differences to be analyzed; that is, differences among behaviors thought to be characteristic of learning disabled or emotionally disturbed children could be analyzed, as could differences between those behaviors characteristic of both groups.

The Disturbing Behavior Checklist I (DBC I was developed to be an indicator of the relative disturbingness of certain behaviors characteristic of emotional disturbance (ED). The first step in deriving the scale was to choose appropriate behavior items. This was done using the Behavior Problem Checklist (BPC), which is a scale that is often used as a screening device for emotionally disturbed children.[1] It contains 55 behaviors thought to be representative of disturbed children. In the normative study for the DBC I, the same 55 items were

included, but individuals were asked to respond to the relative "disturbingness" of behaviors portrayed in those items. It was assumed that this general procedure would provide information regarding the "disturbingness" of each item as well as substantive data from which to derive dimensions of disturbingness. Appendix A presents the DBC I used in the normative study.

The Disturbing Behavior Checklist II (DBC II) was developed to be an indicator of the relative disturbingness of certain behaviors characteristic of learning disabilities (LD). The first step in deriving the scale was to choose appropriate behavioral items. Learning disabilities textbooks generally contain sections which present "characteristics" of the condition; the primary source of the 51 items in the DBC II was information from such sections in several recent texts (Bryan & Bryan, 1975; Hallahan & Cruickshank, 1973; Lerner, 1976; Wallance & McLoughlin, 1975). Forty-five case studies of LD children were examined and found to include 90 percent of the items which were included in the DBC II. Three indicator variables (general perceptual problems, unmanageable behavior, social immaturity) were included to facilitate interpretation of subsequent factors. In the normative study, individuals were asked to respond to the relative "disturbingness" of the 51 items. It was assumed that this general procedure would provide information regarding the "disturbingness" of each item as well as substantive data from which to derive dimensions of disturbing behaviors. Appendix B presents the DBC II used in the normative study.

Normative Study

DBC I

Subjects and Procedure. Approximately 250 individuals were asked to complete the DBC I. The subjects included approximately 100 university students, 90 public school teachers, and 60 supervisors and school psychologists. Each respondent was asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 5, "how disturbing" each item was "in working with children": 1 = not very disturbing, 5 = very disturbing. The data obtained by this procedure were subjected to a principal components factor analysis. All factors with at least one loading of .40 or greater were rotated to a direct oblimin solution and the resulting dimensions were analyzed and interpreted.

Results. The results of the factor analytic procedure used to derive disturbingness dimensions are presented in Table 1; only loadings greater than .40 are included. Each dimension contains behaviors that are "disturbing" relative to certain constructs which are bothersome in working with children: Factor I contains socially immature behaviors, Factor II contains socially defiant behaviors, Factor III contains physically disturbing behaviors, and Factor IV contains socialized delinquent behaviors. Three of the four factors were moderately correlated with each other (I, II, IV) and one was relatively independent of the other three (III).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Means and standard deviations for the items are presented in Table 2. Factor indicators are included as well as mean "disturbingness" values for the items within each factor. An analysis of

the "average disturbingness" of each factor suggested that the socially defiant behaviors (Factor II) were more bothersome than those of the other factors.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Item analysis statistics are contained in Table 3. These results indicate that the scale and factorially derived subscales are relatively reliable. This condition, of course, is necessary but not sufficient for the instrument to be measuring the disturbingness of behavior.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

DBC II

Subjects and Procedure. Approximately 150 advanced undergraduate students were asked to complete the DBC II. Each had taken courses in special education, none had student taught, and most were female (90%). Respondents were asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 5, "how disturbing" each item was "in working with children"; again, 1 = not very disturbing, 5 = very disturbing. The obtained data were analyzed and interpreted in a manner similar to those from the DBC I.

Results. The results of the factor analytic procedure used to derive disturbingness dimensions are presented in Table 4; again, only loadings greater than .40 are included. Each dimension contains behaviors that are "disturbing" relative to certain constructs which are bothersome in working with children: Factor I contains behaviors representative of general perceptual problems, Factor II contains bothersome unmanageable behaviors, and Factor III contains immature behaviors. The three factors were moderately correlated with each other.

Insert Table 4 about here

Means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 5. Factor indicators are also included with the mean "disturbingness" values for each item. An analysis of the "average disturbingness" of each factor suggested that the unmanageable behaviors (Factor II) were more bothersome than those of the other factors.

Insert Table 5 about here

Item analysis statistics are contained in Table 6. The results indicate that the scale and factorially derived subscales are relatively reliable. Again, this condition is necessary but not sufficient for the instrument to be measuring the disturbingness of the behaviors.

Insert Table 6 about here

Subsequent Research

In an attempt to determine the sensitivity and utility of the Disturbing Behavior Checklist, a series of investigations was conducted. Each was designed to address a particular question relative to various types of subjects. Selected information about each study is presented in Table 7. An analysis of the results from this research suggests that a child's behavior may indeed be an important stimulus quality in determining others' attitudes and performances. Similarly, it seems that behaviors characteristic of ED and LD children may generate both within and between group differential reactions. These outcomes are predictable based upon ecological theory, and to some

extent support the validity of the notion of "disturbingness" of behavior.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 7 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Discussion

In discussing the establishment of construct validation, Cronbach (1971) suggested that three types of investigations be included within a validation study. Logical analyses are used to examine the consistency between the construct and the measurement format; correlational and experimental analyses extend the explanation and understanding of the construct. Types of correlational analyses include (a) determining whether clusters of items can be identified within the totality of items representative of the construct in general (i.e., factor analyses), (b) determining whether two groups of individuals likely to differ on the construct in question in fact do differ on the construct measurement instrument, and/or (c) determining whether items representative of the construct are related, yet can be seen as different aspects of the total construct. Experimental analyses serve to identify influences to which the construct may be sensitive; that is, whether ratings representative of the construct can be changed systematically, and/or whether they are differentially influential in decision making.

The disturbing child (or disturbing behavior) has received construct validation support within the framework suggested by Cronbach (1971). The measurement formats of the Disturbing Behavior Checklists provide a means for determining the extent to which various behaviors are rated as differentially disturbing; investigations have

shown both consistent between and within scale variability. Correlational analyses have suggested that meaningful clusters can be represented within total "disturbingness" scales and that items within the scales are related but representative of different aspects of the construct (i.e., factors within DBC I and DBC II correlated moderately). Similarly, groups likely to differ in ratings of the disturbingness of behavior (e.g., special and regular teachers) have been shown to do so. Finally, experimental analyses have shown that ratings of disturbingness of behaviors may be altered by intensive practicum experiences and that those ratings play an important part in decision making (i.e., acceptance of a child as a function of tolerance for behavior).

Conclusions and Implications

Ecological theorists have suggested that "disturbance" may result from an interaction between a child's behavior and reactions to that behavior within an ecosystem (Rhodes, 1967; Swap, 1974). Within such a model, behavior is viewed as "disturbing" rather than "disturbed"; thus equal emphasis is given to the child and to individuals with whom the child interacts. The implications for intervention from an ecological perspective suggest the necessity of altering the child's behavior as well as altering individuals' reactions to that behavior (Algozzine, 1977). Within this context, matching of teachers and children becomes of interest: if children who exhibit certain bothersome behaviors are matched with teachers who are tolerant of those behaviors, "disturbance" in an ecological sense may be avoided.

The finding that behaviors of children are differentially disturbing to teachers also has important assessment implications. If teachers are

reactive to children as a result of their tolerance for their behaviors, a source of bias in referral and assessment may be evident. Some children may have the "assessment cards stacked against them" as a result of the effect their behavior has on important others in the ecosystem. Some evidence exists to suggest that such bias may occur relative to placement of boys and girls in special classes; a common finding in prevalence studies is that boys outnumber girls in special classrooms. Schlosser and Algozzine (1979) have shown that boys' characteristic behaviors are more disturbing than those of girls; it may be that initial referrals and subsequent placements are as much a function of this ecological difference as any other etiological factor.

The Disturbing Behavior Checklists appear to have positive psychometric qualities (i.e., reliability and validity). The construct of a disturbing child (and/or disturbing behavior) has received some validation as a result of the studies which have been conducted. The nature and direction of future research is left to the creative and energetic minds of researchers who will not accept (and find it disturbing) that children may be seen as disabled, disturbed, or otherwise different simply because others see them that way.

References

Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: What you see is what you get? The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 22, 330-333. (a)

Algozzine, B. What teachers perceive--children receive? Communication Quarterly, 1976, 24, 41-47. (b)

Algozzine, B. The emotionally disturbed child: Disturbed or disturbing? Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1977, 5, 205-211.

Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: A matter of opinion? Behavioral Disorders, in press.

Algozzine, B., & Curran, T. Teachers' predictions of a child's school success as a function of their behavioral tolerances. Journal of Educational Research, in press.

Algozzine, B., Mercer, C. D., & Countermine, T. The effects of labels and behavior on teacher expectations. Exceptional Children, 1977, 44, 131-132.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. Physical attractiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 7). New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Bryan, T., & Bryan, J. Understanding learning disabilities. Port Washington, N.Y.: Alfred Publishing, 1975.

Carter, R. How invalid are marks assigned by teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, 43, 218-228.

Coates, B. White adult behavior toward black and white children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 143-154.

Cronbach, L. J. Test validation. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational measurement. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Datta, L., Schaefer, E., & Davis, M. Sex and scholastic aptitude as variables in teachers' ratings of the adjustment and classroom behavior of Negro and other seventh-grade students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 94-101.

Hallahan, D., & Cruickshank, W. Psychoeducational foundations of learning disabilities. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Herr, D., Algozzine, B., & Eaves, R. Amelioration of biases held by teacher trainees toward disturbingness of behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69, 261-264.

Jackson, P., & Lahaderne, H. Inequalities of teacher-pupil contacts. Psychology in the Schools, 1967, 4, 204-211.

Lerner, J. Learning disabilities (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1976.

Lippett, R., & Gold, M. Classroom social structure as a mental health problem. Journal of Social Issues, 1959, 15, 40-49.

Meyer, W., & Thompson, G. Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth-grade children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 385-396.

Mooney, C., & Algozzine, B. A comparison of the disturbingness of LD and ED behaviors. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1978, 6, 401-406.

Palardy, J. What teachers believe - what children achieve. Elementary School Journal, 1969, 69, 370-374.

Rhodes, W. The disturbing child: A problem of ecological management. Exceptional Children, 1967, 33, 449-455.

Rhodes, W. A community participation analysis of emotional disturbance. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 309-314.

Ross, M. B., & Salvia, J. Attractiveness as a biasing factor in teacher judgments. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1975, 80, 96-98.

Rubovitz, P., & Maehr, M. Pygmalion black and white. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 24, 210-218.

Salvia, J., Algozzine, B., & Sheare, J. Attractiveness and school achievement. Journal of School Psychology, 1977, 15, 60-67.

Salvia, J., Sheare, J., & Algozzine, B. Facial attractiveness and personal social development. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1975, 3, 171-178.

Schlosser, L., & Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: He or she? The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1979, 25, 30-36.

Seaver, W. B. Effects of naturally induced teacher expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28, 333-342.

Swap, S. Disturbing classroom behaviors: A developmental and ecological point of view. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, 162-171.

Wallace, G., & McLoughlin, J. Learning disabilities. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.

Footnotes

Bob Algozzine is affiliated with the University of Minnesota Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities.

[1]The Behavior Problem Checklist (BPC) was developed by H. Quay and D. Peterson. It is available in mimeographed form from Dr. Quay. The factor structure of the BPC is very similar to that of the Disturbing Behavior Checklist I.

Table 1

Rotated Factor Loading Pattern for Disturbing Behavior Checklist I

Item and Description	Factor I	II	III	IV
Feeling of inferiority	76*	**		
Anxiety; chronic general fearfulness	76			
Lack of self-confidence	70			
Preoccupation; "in a world of his own"	70			
Depression, chronic sadness	70			
Self-consciousness easily embarrassed	65			
Fixed expression; lack of emotional reactivity	65			
Social withdrawal; preference for solitary activities	64			
Shyness, bashfulness	64			
Tension; inability to relax	61			
Clumsiness, awkwardness; poor muscular coordination	56			
Hypersensitivity; feelings easily hurt	56			
Doesn't know how to have fun	55			
Easily flustered and confused	54			
Aloofness, social reserve	50			
Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness; easily startled	48			
Repetitive speech	47			
Often has physical complaints, e.g., headaches, stomach-aches	46			
Drowsiness	45			
Incoherent speech	44			
Passivity, suggestibility; easily led by others	43			
Sluggishness, lethargy	42			
Disobedience; difficulty in disciplinary control		71		
Impertinence; sauciness		65		
Negativism; tendency to do the opposite of what is requested		62		
Destructiveness in regard to his own and/or others' property		62		
Laziness in school & in performance of other tasks		60		
Fighting		59		
Uncooperativeness in group situations		59		
Temper tantrums		58		
Irresponsibility, undependability		55		
Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others		55		
Attention-seeking, "show-off"		54		
Boisterousness, rowdiness		49		
Inattentiveness to what others say		48		
Irritability, hot tempered; easily aroused to anger		44		
Distractibility		40		
Restlessness, inability to sit still			48	
Hypersensitivity; always on the go			47	
Has bad companions				55
Enuresis, bed-wetting				54
Masturbation				50
Profane language, swearing, cursing				49
Loyal to delinquent friends				45
Truancy from school				41
Stays out late at night				41

*decimal points omitted

**only loadings of .40 or greater are included

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Indicators
for Disturbing Behavior Checklist I Items

Item and Description	$\bar{X}$	SD	F
Oddness, bizarre behavior	3.0	1.0	-
Restlessness, inability to sit still	2.6	1.0	III
Attention-seeking, "show-off"	2.8	1.1	II
Stays out late at night	1.9	1.1	IV
Doesn't know how to have fun	2.6	1.2	I
Self-consciousness; easily embarrassed	2.2	1.0	I
Fixes expression; lack of emotional reactivity	3.1	1.2	I
Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others	3.6	1.0	II
Feelings of inferiority	2.9	1.2	I
Steals in company with others	3.7	1.1	-
Boisterousness, rowdiness	3.0	1.2	II
Crying over minor annoyances and hurts	2.8	1.0	-
Preoccupation; "in a world of his own"	3.0	1.2	I
Shyness, bashfulness	2.0	1.0	I
Social withdrawal; preference for solitary activities	2.5	1.1	I
Dislike for school	2.5	1.2	-
Jealousy over attention paid other children	2.6	0.9	-
Belongs to a gang	1.8	0.9	-
Repetitive speech	2.2	1.0	I
Short attention span	2.4	1.0	-
Lack of self-confidence	2.7	1.1	I
Inattentiveness to what others say	2.9	0.9	II
Easily flustered and confused	2.5	1.0	I
Incoherent speech	2.8	1.2	I
Fighting	3.3	1.2	II
Loyal to delinquent friends	2.5	1.1	IV
Temper tantrums	3.4	1.1	II
Reticence, secretiveness	2.4	1.0	-
Truancy from school	2.9	1.3	IV
Hypersensitivity; feelings easily hurt	2.6	1.0	I
Laziness in school & in performance of other tasks	3.1	1.0	II
Anxiety; chronic general fearfulness	2.9	1.1	I
Irresponsibility, undependability	3.1	1.0	II
Excessive daydreaming	2.8	1.1	-
Masturbation	2.9	1.2	IV
Has bad companions	2.6	1.0	IV
Tension; inability to relax	2.8	1.1	I
Disobedience; difficulty in disciplinary control	3.4	1.0	II
Depression, chronic sadness	3.5	1.2	I
Uncooperativeness in group situations	3.2	0.9	II
Aloofness, social reserve	2.4	1.0	I
Passivity, suggestibility; easily led by others	2.7	1.1	I
Clumsiness, awkwardness; poor muscular coordination	2.0	1.0	I
Hypersensitivity; always on the go	2.5	1.1	III
Distractibility	2.8	0.9	II
Destructiveness in regard to his own and/or others' property	3.9	0.9	II
Negativism; tendency to do the opposite of what is requested	3.6	1.0	II
Impertinence; sauciness	3.2	1.1	II
Sluggishness, lethargy	2.7	1.0	I
Drowsiness	2.6	1.1	I
Profane language, swearing, cursing	2.8	1.3	IV
Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness; easily startled	2.6	1.0	I
Irritability, hot tempered; easily aroused to anger	3.2	1.0	II
Enuresis, bed-wetting	2.4	1.2	IV
Often has physical complaints, e.g., headaches, stomachaches	2.8	1.1	I

Table 3

Item analyses for Disturbing Behavior Checklist I

Subscale	I	II	III	IV	Total
Number of items	22	15	2	7	55
Internal consistency (KR20)	.93	.90	.62	.77	.93
Average item-total correlation	.64	.65	.85	.65	.52
Average inter-item correlation	.39	.38	.44	.32	.18

Table 4

Rotated Factor Loading Pattern for Disturbing Behavior Checklist II

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
being unable to blend sounds	90*	**	
written reversals	85		
inappropriate recall of words and sentences	83		
difficulty remembering letter names	82		
weak auditory memory	81		
confusion of letter sounds	79		
general perceptual problems***	78		
weak visual memory	78		
figure-ground problems	77		
poor word attack skills	73		
not differentiating left from right	72		
confusion with directionality	72		
poor visual-motor integration	71		
letter and word reversals	69		
having difficulty copying shapes	67		
fine motor problems	65		
poor motor development	48		
clumsiness, awkwardness	48		
poor discrimination skills	45		
gross motor problems	45		
disorganization in task approaches	43		
poor posture	41		
unmanageable behavior		68	
hyperactivity		67	
short attention span		58	
being in a state of perpetual motion		57	
lack of motivation		53	
distractibility		51	
rudeness, tactlessness		51	
irritability		47	
an inability to follow directions		46	
carelessness		43	
impulsivity		43	
being easily frustrated		41	
insecurity			83
being shy or withdrawn			80
anxiety with regard to school			66
being unable to assume social responsibility			64
inadequate self concept			64
not participating independently			62
being insecure or craving attention			56
poor interpersonal relationships			56
poor expressive abilities			55
lack of spontaneity in communication			47
social immaturity			47

*decimal points omitted
**only loadings of .40 or greater are included
***"indicator" variables are underlined

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Indicators for Disturbing Behavior Checklist II Items

Item and Description	$\bar{X}$	SD	F
short attention span	2.5	1.0	II
poor discrimination skills	1.9	1.0	I
being easily frustrated	2.4	1.1	II
unmanageable behavior	3.4	1.2	II
weak visual memory	1.8	0.9	I
poor word attack skills	1.7	0.8	I
insensitivity	3.0	1.2	-
saying inappropriate things	2.2	1.0	-
having difficulty copying shapes	1.5	0.8	I
figure-ground problems	1.7	0.9	I
impulsivity	2.3	1.0	II
poor motor development	1.8	1.0	I
inadequate self-concept	2.5	1.3	III
letter and word reversals	1.8	1.0	I
lack of sensitivity regarding others	3.5	1.1	-
poor visual-motor integration	1.9	0.9	I
social immaturity	2.4	1.0	III
poor expressive ability	2.0	1.0	III
weak auditory memory	1.9	0.9	I
distractibility	2.7	1.0	II
poor interpersonal relationship	2.8	1.1	III
confusion of letter sounds	1.9	0.9	I
being in a state of perpetual motion	2.9	1.1	II
laziness in school	3.0	1.1	-
poor posture	1.7	0.8	I
general perceptual problems	2.0	0.9	I
carelessness	2.7	1.1	II
being unable to assume social responsibility	2.6	1.0	III
rudeness, tactlessness	3.4	1.1	II
insecurity	2.3	1.2	III
irritability	2.9	1.0	II
being shy or withdrawn	2.0	1.2	III
lack of spontaneity in communication	2.2	1.1	III
difficulty remembering letter names	1.8	0.9	I
being insecure or craving attention	2.4	1.1	III
written reversals	1.8	0.8	I
hyperactivity	2.7	1.1	II
an inability to follow directions	2.6	1.1	II
not participating independently	2.4	1.0	III
confusion with directionality	1.9	0.9	I
inappropriate recall of words and sentences	1.9	0.9	I
being unable to blend sounds	1.9	0.9	I
not differentiating left from right	1.8	0.9	I
anxiety with regard to school	2.4	1.2	III
perseveration	2.4	1.0	-
limited spontaneous verbalization	2.2	1.0	-
lack of motivation	2.9	1.2	II
fine-motor problems	1.8	0.9	I
disorganization in task approaches	2.2	0.9	I
clumsiness, awkwardness	1.8	0.9	I
gross-motor problems	2.0	1.1	I

Table 6

Item Analyses for Disturbing Behavior Checklist II

Subscale	I	II	III	Total
Number of items	22	12	11	51
Internal Consistency (KR20)	.96	.87	.91	.95
Average item-total correlation	.73	.64	.74	.59
Average inter-item correlation	.50	.36	.49	.26

Table 7

Information Regarding Selected DBC Studies

Study	Question of Interest	Study	Results
Herr, Algozzine, & Eaves (1976)	Extent to which ratings on DBC I vary as a function of intensive practicum experience with disturbed children?	60 Undergraduates 30 Treatment 30 Control	Ratings in treatment group subjects improved after practicum; behaviors in Factor II rated as more disturbing by all subjects.
Algozzine (1976a)	Extent to which ratings on DBC I vary as a function of subject type?	75 teachers and students 25 regular teachers 25 special teachers 25 special ed. majors	Behaviors rated more disturbing by regular class teachers; behaviors in Factor II rated as more disturbing by all subjects.
Algozzine, Mercer, & Countermine (1977)	Extent to which labels and behaviors interact in generating tolerance and acceptability?	128 undergraduates 32 randomly assigned to each of four conditions	Selected behaviors of DBC I were differentiatlly bothersome as a function of the label assigned to the child thought to exhibit them.
Mooney & Algozzine (1978)	Extent to which behaviors within and between DBC I and DBC II were differentially disturbing?	30 vocational education teachers	Behaviors in DBC I were generally more disturbing than those in DBC II; Factor II was more disturbing within DBC I and Factor II was more disturbing within DBC II; Factor II of DBC I was more disturbing than Factor II of DBC II.
Schlosser & Algozzine (1979)	Extent to which behaviors characteristic of boys were more disturbing than those characteristic of girls?	90 teachers 30/replication	Behaviors more characteristic of boys were more bothersome to teachers than those characteristic of girls.
Algozzine (in press)	Extent to which behaviors in DBC I are differentially bothersome to regular and special teachers?	38 teachers 19 regular teachers 19 special teachers	Ratings of regular teachers were significantly higher than those of special teachers; Factor II behaviors rated as more disturbing by all subjects.
Algozzine & Curran (in press)	Extent to which interaction potential varies as a function of teacher tolerance for exhibited behavior from DBC I?	44 regular teachers 11 assigned to each of four groups	Teachers were more accepting of a case study child when the child's behavior matched their tolerance and less accepting when the behavior conflicted with their tolerance.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Disturbing Behavior Checklist (DBC) I

Please respond to each item indicating how disturbing it would be in working with children. ND means "not very disturbing" and VD means "very disturbing". Ask yourself, "In working with children, is" ...item..."disturbing to me", then answer the item.

Item and Description	ND				VD
Oddness, bizarre behavior	1	2	3	4	5
Restlessness, inability to sit still	1	2	3	4	5
Attention-seeking, "show-off"	1	2	3	4	5
Stays out late at night	1	2	3	4	5
Doesn't know how to have fun	1	2	3	4	5
Self-consciousness; easily embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
Fixed expression; lack of emotional reactivity	1	2	3	4	5
Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of inferiority	1	2	3	4	5
Steals in company with others	1	2	3	4	5
Boisterousness, rowdiness	1	2	3	4	5
Crying over minor annoyances and hurts	1	2	3	4	5
Preoccupation; "in a world of his own"	1	2	3	4	5
Shyness, bashfulness	1	2	3	4	5
Social withdrawal; preference for solitary activities	1	2	3	4	5
Dislike for school	1	2	3	4	5
Jealousy over attention paid other children	1	2	3	4	5
Belongs to a gang	1	2	3	4	5
Repetitive speech	1	2	3	4	5
Short attention span	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of self-confidence	1	2	3	4	5
Inattentiveness to what others say	1	2	3	4	5
Easily flustered and confused	1	2	3	4	5
Incoherent speech	1	2	3	4	5
Fighting	1	2	3	4	5
Loyal to delinquent friends	1	2	3	4	5
Temper tantrums	1	2	3	4	5
Reticence, secretiveness	1	2	3	4	5
Truancy from school	1	2	3	4	5
Hypersensitivity; feelings easily hurt	1	2	3	4	5
Laziness in school & in performance of other tasks	1	2	3	4	5
Anxiety; chronic general fearfulness	1	2	3	4	5
Irresponsibility; undependability	1	2	3	4	5
Excessive daydreaming	1	2	3	4	5
Masturbation	1	2	3	4	5
Has bad companions	1	2	3	4	5
Tension; inability to relax	1	2	3	4	5
Disobedience; difficulty in disciplinary control	1	2	3	4	5
Depression, chronic sadness	1	2	3	4	5
Uncooperativeness in group situations	1	2	3	4	5
Passivity, suggestibility; easily led by others	1	2	3	4	5
Aloofness, social reserve	1	2	3	4	5
Clumsiness, awkwardness; poor muscular coordination	1	2	3	4	5
Hypersensitivity; always on the go	1	2	3	4	5
Distractibility	1	2	3	4	5
Destructiveness in regard to his own and/or others property	1	2	3	4	5
Negativism; tendency to do the opposite of what is requested	1	2	3	4	5
Impertinence; sauciness	1	2	3	4	5
Sluggishness, lethargy	1	2	3	4	5
Drowsiness	1	2	3	4	5
Profane language, swearing, cursing	1	2	3	4	5
Nervousness, jitteriness, jumpiness; easily startled	1	2	3	4	5
Irritability, hot tempered; easily aroused to anger	1	2	3	4	5
Enuresis, bed-wetting	1	2	3	4	5
Often has physical complaints, e.g., headaches, stomachaches	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

Please respond to each of the following items indicating how disturbing it is in working with children. Ask yourself, "In working with children, is (are) '...item...' disturbing to me?", then answer the item. NVD=Not very disturbing (1) VD=Very disturbing (5)

Item and Description	NVD				VD
Short attention span	1	2	3	4	5
Poor discrimination skills	1	2	3	4	5
Being easily frustrated	1	2	3	4	5
Unmanageable behavior	1	2	3	4	5
Weak visual memory	1	2	3	4	5
Poor word attack skills	1	2	3	4	5
Insensitivity	1	2	3	4	5
Saying inappropriate things	1	2	3	4	5
Having difficulty copying shapes	1	2	3	4	5
Figure-ground problems	1	2	3	4	5
Impulsivity	1	2	3	4	5
Poor motor development	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate self-concept	1	2	3	4	5
Letter and word reversals	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of sensitivity regarding others	1	2	3	4	5
Poor visual-motor integration	1	2	3	4	5
Social immaturity	1	2	3	4	5
Poor expressive abilities	1	2	3	4	5
Weak auditory memory	1	2	3	4	5
Distractibility	1	2	3	4	5
Poor interpersonal relationships	1	2	3	4	5
Confusion of letter sounds	1	2	3	4	5
Being in a state of perpetual motion	1	2	3	4	5
Laziness in school	1	2	3	4	5
Poor posture	1	2	3	4	5
General perceptual problems	1	2	3	4	5
Carelessness	1	2	3	4	5
Being unable to assume social responsibility	1	2	3	4	5
Rudeness, tactlessness	1	2	3	4	5
Insecurity	1	2	3	4	5
Irritability	1	2	3	4	5
Being shy or withdrawn	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of spontaneity in communication	1	2	3	4	5
Difficulty remembering letter names	1	2	3	4	5
Being insecure or craving attention	1	2	3	4	5
Written reversals	1	2	3	4	5
Hyperactivity	1	2	3	4	5
An inability to follow directions	1	2	3	4	5
Not participating independently	1	2	3	4	5
Confusion with directionality	1	2	3	4	5
Inappropriate recall of words and sentences	1	2	3	4	5
Being unable to blend sounds	1	2	3	4	5
Not differentiating left from right	1	2	3	4	5
Anxiety with regard to school	1	2	3	4	5
Perseveration	1	2	3	4	5
Limited spontaneous verbalization	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of motivation	1	2	3	4	5
Fine motor problems	1	2	3	4	5
Disorganization in task approaches	1	2	3	4	5
Clumsiness, awkwardness	1	2	3	4	5
Gross motor problems	1	2	3	4	5

PUBLICATIONS

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
University of Minnesota

The Institute is not funded for the distribution of its publications. Publications may be obtained for $2 per document, a fee designed to cover printing and postage costs. Only checks and money orders payable to the University of Minnesota can be accepted. All orders must be prepaid.

Requests should be directed to: Editor
Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
350 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Ysseldyke, J. E. Assessing the learning disabled youngster: The state of the art (Research Report No. 1). November, 1977.

*Ysseldyke, J. E. Research and development plan: University of Minnesota Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities (Monograph No. 1). June, 1978.

*Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). Synthesis of the knowledge base: Identification and assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 2). June, 1978.

*Ysseldyke, J. E. Organizational plan for Minnesota's Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities (Monograph No. 3). June, 1978.

*Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. Specific investigations to be completed during years two and three (Monograph No. 4). June, 1978.

*Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. Training opportunities at Minnesota's Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities (Monograph No. 5). June, 1978.

*Ysseldyke, J. E. Client base (Monograph No. 6). June, 1978.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Regan, R. R. Nondiscriminatory assessment and decision making (Monograph No. 7). February, 1979.

*As part of its continuation proposal, the Institute was required to prepare these monographs. Because they are part of the proposal, they are not available for general distribution.

**Thurlow, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Assessment in the child service demonstration centers for learning disabled children (Research Report No. 2). March, 1979.

Foster, G., Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. Susceptibility to stereotypic bias (Research Report No. 3). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B. An analysis of the disturbingness and acceptability of behaviors as a function of diagnostic label (Research Report No. 4). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & McGraw, K. Diagnostic testing in mathematics: An extension of the PIAT? (Research Report No. 5). March, 1979.

Deno, S. L. A direct observation approach to measuring classroom behavior: Procedures and application (Research Report No. 6). April, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Mirkin, P. K. Proceedings of the Minnesota roundtable conference on assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 8). April, 1979.

Somwaru, J. P. A new approach to the assessment of learning disabilities (Monograph No. 9). April, 1979.

Algozzine, B., Forgnone, C., Mercer, C. D., & Trifiletti, J. J. Toward defining discrepancies for specific learning disabilities: An analysis and alternatives (Research Report No. 7). June, 1979.

Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: A validation report (Research Report No. 8). June, 1979.

**This research report is not being distributed by the Institute. Requests for it should be directed to: The NETWORK, 290 S. Main Street, Andover, Massachusetts 01810.